DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 298 SP 015 578

AUTHOR Driscoll, Robert L.; Wheeler, Daniel
TITLE Teacher Education Center--A Displaced Campus School?
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; *Laboratory Schools; *Preservice Education; *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

The similarities and differences between teacher education centers and campus schools are examined to clarify the objectives of the trend towards field-based teacher education. The central question of the issue is whether or not teacher centers are in fact displaced campus schools and whether this fact will render the campus school obsolete. Function similarities of campus schools and teacher centers are examined. Checkpoints of similarity between the two are identified, and results are given as they relate to the goals of teacher education. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER
——A DISPLACED CAMPUS SCHOOL?

Dr. Robert L. Driscoll
Kennesaw College

Dr. Daniel Wheeler
S.U.C. at Fredonia, New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bob Driscoll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED182298

The campus schools, believed to be the key component to teacher preparation, appear to be dying a slow, agonizing death! The underlying reasons for the decline boil down to (1) expenditures of managing campus schools being disproportionate to the caliber of programs and teaching products it yielded (2) goals, functions, and operations being hopelessly locked into a closed system dominated by the university structure.

The university reaction to the closing of campus schools has been a gradual, increased effort to field base more of their teacher education programs. One of the major vehicles for supporting the field based effort has been teacher education centers.

After spending considerable time in center development and dialogue with university and public school colleagues one major question eventually becomes a tantamount concern: Is the center idea the same as the Campus School? Usually, the question is framed in a defensive, troubled context. The answers provided to date have not sufficed in providing most questioners with an assurance that the two concepts have differences. The following discussion, then, is an attempt to delineate the differences between the campus school and the teacher education center concepts.

SP015578

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE CAMPUS SCHOOL

Campus Schools were identified by Blair, Curtis, Noon[1] as comprising several types. The types of campus schools consisted of the practice school,

the model school, the training school, the demonstration school and the experimental school. The name-types were not always faithful to their initial prototype and eventually original purposes and functions became hazy and in some cases non-existent. Regardless, the purposes that evolved focused upon:

1. providing variation in educational experiences for students preparing to be teachers
2. creating an environment for creativity and scientific inquiry
3. studying human behavior
4. providing the context for educational leadership
5. establishing a setting for professional interaction.

The campus school models were usually staffed by professionally mobile and competent classroom teachers. It was believed that if the best teachers were brought together and placed under supportive circumstances that innovation and experimentation would follow. The central role of the campus school teacher normally fell into two dimensions: (1) teaching campus school students (2) supervising prospective teachers at the observation, participation and student teaching stages. It may be an overstatement but, for many campus school teachers, teaching children evolved as a secondary concern -- the central concern became preparing teachers. It was assumed that good teaching techniques and models would naturally focus upon students.

The other significant group that had major input into the campus school was the university teacher education staff. In most instances, the university staff was idealized as providing the theoretical and experimental models while the campus school teachers provided the practitioner insights to make the models work.

As campus school staff and enrollment grew, it did not take long for a chasm to develop between the university staff, which usually had one set of expectations for the campus school and the practitioners, who had another set of expectations. What tended to follow was: the university staff would separately teach methods courses and the campus school staff would provide the classroom experiences. The purpose, integration of theory - practice, frequently became lost in dislike, disrespect, distrust, and separatism.

The campus school organizations, then, had the tendency to turn into models which perpetuated their own culture in dealing with outside ideas; they subsequently built their own system of defense. The campus school became a place where separate but unequal co-existence with professors from the "ivory tower" became the dominant pattern of behavior. As a result, campus schools tended to perpetuate their own norms and became closed systems; likewise, the university staff.

The rewards of the university dominated system provided another conflict area as they chiefly went to the college professors. The reasons advanced for this were that the college professors fulfilled the traditional university functions of experimenting, researching, writing and teaching; the campus school staff, whose chief concern was teaching, typically received lesser status and increases in salary. This hardly served to cement relations.

The campus schools and their differing forms of theory became entangled in a university dominated structure; the defensive ways of coping with the status, power, and differing expectancies became the eventual undoing of what once held unlimited potential for teacher preparation.

The overall result of campus schools being withdrawn from the university scene was an attempt to replace the campus school experiences with similar

experiences in the public school setting. One configurative pattern which appeared to meet the demands of the new relationships being forged by a greater need to utilize public schools for teacher education preparatory experiences was the Teacher Education Center.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

Organizationally, the Teacher Education Center is a partnership between a school system and one or more teacher preparation institutions, with the possible inclusion of the professional associations and the State Department of Education.[2] Herein lies a significant departure between the campus school models and the Teacher Education Center concept. The planning, development, implementation and administration of the Teacher Education Center is jointly undertaken by public school systems and university through the development of a Center Steering Committee. The Teacher Education Center Steering Committee facilitates open, continuous interaction between the faculty of the university and center staff members. The Center Steering Committee usually consists of representatives from the community, teachers of the schools, administrative staffs, university staff, and student teachers. The partnership is based upon a mutual acceptance of philosophy and goals and one that is committed to:

1. preservice activities which entail the preparation of education students for a teaching career
2. inservice activities based upon assessed needs of teachers.

Usually, center organization includes mutual agreement about facilities, involvement of the instructional staff, resource consultants, tuition-free sequence of courses, workshops, and seminars designed to develop a resident staff, and shared salary of a center coordinator.

Significant to the above agreements is the mutual acceptance of philosophy and goals; without mutual goals, centers become an open arena ready made for inter-institutional conflict. It is the authors' opinion that the identification and agreement of mutual goals between university and public schools serves as one of the most significant departure points for identifying the major difference between a teacher education center and any one of the campus school types. It provides the university and public schools with a constant check point - it is the beginning of a more meaningful relationship in the teacher preparation process.

FUNCTION SIMILARITIES OF CENTERS AND CAMPUS SCHOOL TYPES

The similarity of functions between the campus school models and Teacher Education Centers provide the stimulus for much of the present concern of educators about campus schools being displaced to the public schools. The functions appear to be similar; however, when examined further, the similarity dissipates. The functions that most campus schools and Teacher Education Centers have in common are:

1. each provide direct experience to increase the relationship between theory and practice for students preparing to be teachers
2. each carry on educational experimentation and research
3. each stimulate professional leadership and staff development concerns.

The focus of the discussion that follows will be to establish the distinctions between the similar functions of the center and campus school types. The discussion will also provide a system of "check points" which, if meaningfully planned for, provide the basis for keeping centers from becoming displaced campus schools.

FUNCTION: DIRECT EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS OF TEACHING

THE CAMPUS SCHOOL AND DIRECT EXPERIENCES

The gap beyween theory and direct experience has been difficult for teacher educators to resolve. It is usually assumed that the more opportunity a future teacher has for first-hand contact with students, the more she/he will be able to put into practice the concepts-theories learned in campus based courses. In general, the direct experience function comprises observation of students in learning conditions, limited participation experiences, and finally, the extended student teaching experience.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER AND DIRECT EXPERIENCES

The teacher education center provides the same form of direct experiences as the campus school with special emphasis placed upon individualized intensive and extensive [2] teaching experiences of student teachers. The intensive experiences relate to the student teaching assignment being under the direct supervisor over an extended period of time; the extensive teaching experience relates to the part of student teaching that deals with short durational experience in a variety of classrooms and with a variety of school personnel. The individualized experience is determined by combining the needed experiences of the student teachers with those of skills, strengths and interests of the combined staffs of the schools in the center.

Systematic development of teaching competencies is additionally concerted through micro-teaching, mini courses, and instructional modules. The use of cognitive and affective analytic systems assist in the analysis of a university student's continued development.

In addition to the above experiences, some centers provide a context for the teaching of undergraduate methods courses. The methods courses are

coordinated by a Center Co-ordinator and reflect the integration of university and the center schools needs. In other words, the methods courses are carefully planned and implemented by staff members of the center schools and university. Methods are taught on site and teacher education students work with students in tutoring, small group and large group settings.

Check Point: Direct Experiences for Students of Teaching

The check point in this function must be the needs of students in the center schools; the students must be the focal point of all instructional decisions. This includes the multitude of ways which developing students in teacher preparation can contribute to the academic and psychological well-being of public school students. The emphasis for this check point must be assessment, diagnostic, and prognostic skills of student teachers and teachers as they relate to students who are in the process of learning. Having the student teacher's skill as the ultimate or central concern would place the center in the same danger as that of many campus schools of the past.

Chart One

Function: Direct Experiences for Students of Teaching

Campus School	Center	Check Point
Tightly controlled often unrealistic	Relates to shared purposes of schools Individualized-intensive/extensive experiences in public schools	Needs of students in Center Schools

FUNCTION: PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP/IN SERVICE

The Campus School and Professional Leadership

The campus school, created as it was, placed direct control of the preparation program in the hands of the university. It is the control feature that significantly differentiates the campus school function of professional leadership and inservice activities from those found in the teacher education center.

First, it was held that the campus school was organized to provide leadership and inservice work for teacher educators and public school personnel. The basic model followed a process that entailed dispensing change to public schools; it suggested that viable change models should first be tried in a setting where most variables could be controlled. Exportation would then occur with the campus school and university staff providing the team of consultants to assist in the development and implementation of the change.

Second, the campus school and university staffs were idealized as providing the leadership expertise to state, local and national organizations. It was believed that since the campus school would serve as resource and innovational centers, it would follow that staff members would serve in professional leadership positions.

The major emphasis behind the professional leadership, inservice design was found in the campus school providing the leadership and expertise while the public schools would be the seekers. This design and its underlying assumptions eventually gave way as public schools began to perceive themselves as being in a different position than "seeking out."

The Teacher Education Center and Leadership/In Service

The teacher education center provides the context for the leadership inservice dimension to be undertaken through the collaboration of public schools, community, and university. The significant departure point is found in the collaborative relationship of the teacher education center and the unilateral design of the campus school. A comment should be made at this point regarding the unilateral design of the campus school. It is not intended to imply that the campus school arrangement did not cooperate with the public schools. One can find many excellent examples where the campus school entered into cooperative endeavors with public schools. The collaborative design behind the teacher education centers, however, assumes the sharing of decision making power by affected parties; furthermore, it provides the context of sharing resources to support programs within the center schools.

Control of the center arrangement is found in its attempt to design leadership and inservice activities based upon the needs of staff members, students, and the community. A design that provides for the collaborative development of inservice and leadership includes organizing around the following dimensions.:

1. needs assesment of school staff, students, and community
2. selection of an Improvement Program
3. organization and Implementation of Improvement Program
4. provision for Administrative/Resource Support
5. evaluation of the program and related processes.

The central way in which the leadership, inservice function is brought about is through the steering committee of the center. The steering committee was briefly discussed in the Center Overview.

Check Point: Professional Leadership/Inservice

The checkpoint of the leadership/inservice dimension is found in the needs assessment and collaborative processes. Since each major partner has an expressed communication route (The Center Steering Committee), specific areas of needs may be shared and integrated into the on-going instructional and curricular program of the center. Again, the ultimate checkpoint is whether increased learning opportunities for students has occurred as a result of collaborative endeavors.

The professional leadership/inservice dimensions, then, has basic differences from the Campus School. These differences are depicted in Chart Two.

Chart Two

Function: Leadership and Inservice

Campus School	Center	Check Point
Goals determined by university and campus school staff.	Goals mutually arrived at by partners.	Leadership/Inservice arrived at by collaboration processes.
	Inservice planned around needs assessment processes.	Increased learning opportunitites for students.
	Resources brought into center based upon identified need.	

FUNCTION: EXPERIMENTATION, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The Campus School and Experimentation, Research and Innovation

Campus schools were usually created having the research and innovation

component as one of their central functions. It was believed that a unique setting needed to be developed which would encourage the creation of new knowledge; which would identify resourceful patterns for educating students and finally, which would would provide the context for the systematic study of human behavior under experimental conditions.

With the campus schools serving as the arena for new advancements in curriculum and instruction it was believed that the campus schools would provide the dissemination base for the exportation of innovations.

While the innovative thrust was noble in concept several inhibiting factors evolved. Some of these inhibitors were:

1. the growing disenchantment of public schools towards innovative practices being developed and implemented in settings that were far different than their own.

2. practices surrounding the system of rewards which alledgedly favored the university researchers but not the implementers in the campus schools.

3. organizational practices that encouraged maintenance of current programs. As a result, the uniqueness that the campus school setting provided gave way to bland, safe approaches to instruction and teacher education.

Check Point: Experimentation, Research, Innovation

The check point for the experimentation, research and innovation dimension is found in the deliberative processes of the center steering committee. It is this governing body that determines whether the research or innovation is in the best interest of students, needs of the school and community. While steering committee involvement is not without problems, it appears that the open examination of the relative merits of research and innovation may be far more positive than no check point at all.

Chart Three

Function: Experimentation, Research and Innovation

Campus School	Center	Check Point
Research/Innovation Exported to Public Schools	Research Innovation of School Community and University concerns	Whether research innovation contributes to learning of students
Research/Innovation often unrelated to problems of public schools	Supports instructional and Curricular development of specific setting	Needs of community, schools and university

SUMMARY

The central difference between a teacher education center and a campus school rests upon the foundation of shared decision making. The vehicle which expedites the decision making is the Center Steering Committee. This committee considers decision areas that entail preservice teaching experiences, leadership and inservice needs, experimentation, research and innovation. Chart Four that follows shows the total perspective of the major distinctions between a teacher education center and campus school.

It is the opinion of the authors that if a steering committee exists and if the check points are identified and monitored, the teacher education center may not fall into the trap of becoming a displaced campus school.

REFERENCES

1. Blair, Lois et.al., "The Purposes, Functions, and Uniqueness of The College-Controlled Laboratory School", The Association For Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 9, 1958.

2. Collins, James, "The Teacher Education Center Concept: A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education", Educational Leadership, No. 6, (March, 1970), 544-47.

3. Collins, James, "The Making of a Teaching Center", Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXV, Number 1, Spring, 1974.

4. Schmieder, Allen A., Yarger, Sam J., "Teaching/Teacher Centering in America", Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXV, Number 1, Spring, 1974.